

1 convenience of the parties and witnesses, and will promote the
2 interests of justice." *Pfeiffer v. Himax Techs., Inc.*, 530 F.
3 Supp. 2d 1121, 1123 (C.D. Cal. 2008). The court must weigh several
4 factors in determining whether transfer is appropriate: (1) the
5 location where the relevant agreements were negotiated and
6 executed; (2) the state that is most familiar with the governing
7 law; (3) the plaintiff's choice of forum; (4) the respective
8 parties' contacts with the forum; (5) the contacts relating to
9 plaintiff's cause of action in the chosen forum; (6) the
10 differences in the cost of litigation in the two forums; (7) the
11 availability of compulsory process to compel witnesses; and (8) the
12 ease of access to sources of proof. *Jones v. GNC Franchising,*
13 *Inc.*, 211 F.3d 495, 498-99 (9th Cir. 2000).

14 Having considered the parties' pleadings and the relevant
15 factors above, the court concludes that the parties should provide
16 the court with additional argument and evidence specifically
17 directed to whether the Central District of California court would
18 have personal jurisdiction over defendant Blizzard US and subject
19 matter jurisdiction over the plaintiff's claims. Accordingly,
20 defendants are hereby ordered to supplement their motion to
21 transfer venue on or before February 6, 2017, to address the above
22 factors. Plaintiff shall have until February 13, 2017, to file any
23 response.

24 IT IS SO ORDERED.

25 DATED: This 27th day of January, 2017.

26 
27

28 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE